

1 KEVIN V. RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
2 United States Attorney

3 MARK L. KROTOSKI (CSBN 138549)  
4 Chief, Criminal Division

5 THOMAS M. O'CONNELL (NYSBN 1801950)  
6 Assistant United States Attorney

7 150 Almaden Blvd., Suite 900  
8 San Jose, California 95113  
9 Telephone: (408) 535-5053  
10 FAX: (408) 535-5066  
11 Thomas.M.OConnell@usdoj.gov

12 Attorneys for Plaintiff

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 SAN JOSE DIVISION

16 \*E-FILED - 10/17/06\*

17 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, ) No. CR 06-00425 RMW  
18 Plaintiff, )  
19 v. ) STIPULATION AND  
20 CHRISTINA MARIE FLORES, and ) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME  
21 JOSE LITO CAMPOS, )  
22 Defendants. ) SAN JOSE VENUE  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )  
28 )

29 On September 18, 2006 , the parties in this case appeared before the Court for a status  
30 conference. The parties jointly requested that the case be continued to October 23, 2006 at 9:00  
31 a.m. in order for both defense counsel to review the discovery in this case. In addition, the  
32 parties requested an exclusion of time under the Speedy Trial Act from September 18, 2006 until  
33 October 23, 2006. Defendant Flores, who was present with her attorney, J.A. Hudson, agreed to  
34 the exclusion. Defendant Campos, who was present with his attorney Assistant Federal Public  
35 Defender Cynthia Lie, also agreed to the exclusion. The parties agree and stipulate that an  
36 exclusion of time is appropriate based on the defendant's need for effective preparation of  
37 counsel.

1 SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN  
United States Attorney

3 DATED: 09/20/06

4 /s/  
THOMAS M. O'CONNELL  
Assistant United States Attorney

5 DATED: 09/20/06

6 /s/  
CYNTHIA C. LIE  
7 Assistant Federal Public Defender  
Counsel for Mr. Campos

8 DATED: 09/20/06

9 /s/  
J.A. HUDSON  
10 Counsel for Ms. Flores

11 Accordingly, for good cause shown, the Court HEREBY ORDERS that time be excluded  
12 under the Speedy Trial Act from September 18, 2006 to October 23, 2006. The Court finds,  
13 based on the aforementioned reasons, that the ends of justice served by granting the requested  
14 continuance outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. The  
15 failure to grant the requested continuance would deny defense counsel reasonable time necessary  
16 for effective preparation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a  
17 miscarriage of justice. The Court therefore concludes that this exclusion of time should be made  
18 under 18 U.S.C. §§ 3161(h)(8)(A) and (B)(iv).

19 SO ORDERED.

20 DATED: 10/17/06

21 /S/ RONALD M. WHYTE  
22 RONALD M. WHYTE  
23 United States District Judge